THE "POLITICAL THEORY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA"

BEING THE FIRST LECTURE

UNDER THE

Right Hon'ble V. SRINIVASA SASTRI FOUNDATION

DELIVERED AT THE SENATE HOUSE, MADRAS,

28th and 29th **FEBRUARY** 1928

BY

M. RUTHNASWAMY, M.A., (*Cantab*) *Barrister-at-Law.*

THOMPSON & Co. (MINERVA PRESS),

33, Broadway, Madras.

272

I

I must thank the Syndicate of the University of Madras for the great nour they have conferred upon me in asking me to deliver the first ture on th Right Honourable V. Srinivasa Sastri Foundation. It is a small compliment to the community of teachers that the Foundation which bears the honoured name of one teacher should start its history with the name, however, subaltern, of another.

I purpose in these lectures to describe the political theory which has overned the policy and the activities of the Government of India. The rm "Government of India" determines the initial date of this historical scription at 1858, when the Crown assumed the Government of the untry as a whole, and the terms of the endowment, which require hat the subject of these lectures shall be a topic of political science with pecial reference to India, extends the other chronological limit to recent imes. An attempt to analyse the political theory upon which the government of India during the past 70 years has been founded would be instructive at the present moment; for, if the present flows out of the past, it may not be bootless to enquire on what philosophy of rule the Government of India has been conducted, so that the mistakes of the past may be avoided and the right road may be followed to the greater good and better government of the country. But we are confronted by an initial difficulty. Have rulers of India had any political theory which governed the conduct of their government? We know the political character of Englishmen. To solve the problem of the hour, to take up and tackle each problem as it comes, to eschew all philosophy of conduct, but to act promptly, vigorously effectively, has been the way of the Englishmen in the government of his own country as in that of the colonies and dependencies committed by his own will and the circumstances of history to his care. "*Primum vivere, deinde philosophari*" has been the motto of his political life. What Lord Morley said in his "*Recollections*" of the Indian Viceroy is applicable to the preponderant majority of those concerned with the Government of India. "The Indian Viceroy" he said, "is not bound to know political philosophy or juristic theory, or constitutional history: he is first and foremost an administrator and the working head of a complica d civil and military service." "Inconsistency of character and absenc defi-nite aim" says Lord Cromer* "are most notable Anglo-saxon q es." and they, in his opinion, have been illustrated in the history of British rule in India, as in Egypt. But, however much man may repudiate the influence of thought and first principles, his actions, merely because he is hinking animal, proceed from ideas. Men, even Englishmen, are philo-hers without knowing it. Behind the most unpremeditated acts of

* *Political and Literary Essays*—First series.

English statesmen there has preceded some train of thought. It may be true that Englishmen have blundered into empire. But the blundering refers only to methods, not to purpose or object. It may be that "a great quantity of writing about India" as Alfred Lyall said years ago, "and much of what has been done in India is necessarily founded upon guess-work and half-knowledge, which accounts for such hazardous speculation in the department of thought and action." But some thinking and some philosophy there have been among Englishmen behind their rule in Ind[illegible]

In attempting to discover the sources of political thought as it affe[illegible] the Government of India, we are fortunately not required to wander over the whole range of English political thought, for we are concerned only with that of the supreme rulers of India, those that have been charged with the duty of laying down the principles of Indian policy. Primarily and mainly, they would be the Secretaries of State and the Viceroys. Under the law and custom of the English constitution and in the circumstances of party government in England, although the Parliament of Great Britain is supreme over the Government of India and private members may air their views during Indian debates, it is the Secretary of State that lays down the policy of the Government of India. The speeches and writings, therefore, of Secretaries of State form one of the most important sources for any historical analysis of the political theory of that Government. And as a Secretary of State, however, masterful he may be, is obliged to depend on the man on the spot on account of the distance between England and India, his ignorance of Indian affairs till he assumes office (which by the way, was the main reason why a Council of India was associated with him) and his preoccupation with English party politics, the Viceroy and Governor-General of India has a principal voice in the determination of Indian policy. To take two different periods in the history of the Government of India, the correspondence between a forward looking Viceroy like Lord Ripon and a constitutionally slow Secretary of State like Lord Hartington, who is once reported to have yawned in the middle of his own speech, and that between a realistic Viceroy Like Lord Minto and a Liberal anxious to appear conservative like Lord Morley, show how much the Viceroy can do to shape Indian policy.* The speeches and writings of Viceroys and Governors-General of India form the most important source of the English political thought with which we are concerned. But, for my purpose, I have preferred what I may call the undress views of these statesmen published in private letters and reminiscences to those that may be gathered from full dress debates and official despatches. English public opinion is only occasionally brought to bear upon Indian affairs. But this is done more by means of books and pamphlets than through the newspaper press which can hardly find room for Indian copy. Much of this contribution is made by retired Anglo-Indian administrators like Chesney and Strachey and Sir Alfred Lyall. Correspondents of the

* See the correspondence in Wolff's *Life of Lord Ripon* and Buchan's *Life of Lord Minto.*

272

great London Newspapers like Sir Valentine Chirol and Sir Sidney Low, independent thinkers like Lord Bryce Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, and Sir Henry Summer Maine, also served to educate the masters of India.† The speeches and writings of these classes of writers and thinkers must be brought under review if we are to know the political theory or theories that determined the policy of Government in India.

When in 1858, as a result of the convulsion of the Sepoy Mutiny, the Crown assumed the Government of India, Queen Victoria, in consultation with her responsible Ministers, issued a proclamation, the famous proclamation of 1858, to the Princes and People of India, which laid down certain general principles on which the Government of India should be conducted. That proclamation is well known to you, so I need not quote it in full. What is necessary for our purpose is that the political ideas embodied in that document should be taken out of it. The promotion of internal peace and good government, religious toleration and liberty, equality before the law, a career open to talents, the protection of rights already enjoyed by princes or people, especially rights in land, due regard being paid to the ancient rights, usages and customs of India,—these sum up as well the duties of Government as the rights of citizens of the India of the future. One representative paragraph of that document lays down what shall be the duties of the State in India. "When," it runs, "by the blessing of Providence internal tranquility shall be restored, it is our earnest desire to stimulate the peaceful industry of India, to promote works of public utility and improvement, and to administer the government for the benefit of all our subjects resident therein." This proclamation, therefore, places before the Government in India, the material progress of the country as its most important object. Not that political rights and privileges are denied to the people. Religious toleration and liberty, equality before the law, maintenance of already accrued rights, a career open to talents are not such negligible political gains and were not so easily acquired in England and Europe that they need be despised and held of no account. But the student of politics will note that, apart from the allusion to these negative, although important, political rights, there is not a word in the whole of the proclamation of the positive active rights of free citizenship, of liberty or self-government for the people of India, even as an ideal of remote policy. It is certainly unhistorical to expect that the English Government, on the morrow of a military revolt which had shaken British rule in India as it had been shaken never before, would think of laying the foundations of freedom and self-government for the people of the country. First things had to come first, and the foundations of political life had to be repaired and strengthened before the architect could think of building a superstructure. And the historian will not condemn the British Govern-

† Sir Alfred Lyall has left on record that "when Maine and Stephen came home with strong views on our side and strong impressions upon the real state of affairs, the public listens to them" *vide Life of Sir Alfred Lyall* by Mortimer Durand.

ment of the days immediately succeeding the Mutiny of 1858 for confining its policy to laying the foundations of peace and good government in India. But we must note the fact that the ply given by the Proclamation of 1858 was taken by Indian policy ever since that time down to the other day. Even when British statesmen went beyond the production of mere material progress and aimed at the moral and intellectual improvement of the people, they will aim at the good of the people to be promoted by themselves and not through the people. The British Government of those days determined to act on the principle of the enlightened despotism of the 18th century—"everything for the people, nothing through the people." Sir Charles Wood, the first Secretary of State for India under the new regime, instituted a number of fundamental reforms which, according to the chronicler of his administration arose from his policy "which was to govern India for the good of the greatest number of 180 millions consigned to the care of England."* How fundamental these reforms were the student of history knows, for they deal with education, public works, irrigation. Lord Canning's famous declaration that danger for danger he would rather see even the European forces reduced than unpopular taxes imposed upon the people at large, and Lord Lawrence's view that low taxation was the panacea for all Indian evils breathes the same spirit of benevolent regard for the material welfare of the people.

The same ideas of enlightened and benevolent despotism animated the policy of all the earlier Secretaries of State and Viceroys of India. The Earl of Mayo's ideal of good government in the Native states was what he wanted in British India. It was as he said in his Speech to the Chiefs of Rajputana "that justice and order shall prevail, that every man's property shall be secure, that the traveller shall come and go in safety, that the cultivator shall enjoy the fruits of his labours, and the trader the produce of his commerce: that you shall make roads, and undertake the construction of those works of irrigation which will improve the condition of the people and swell the revenues of your States: that you shall encourage education and provide for the relief of the sick."† He used more impressive language when speaking of the duties of the rulers of British India. "I believe", he said, "we have not done our duty to the people of the land. Millions have been spent on the conquering race which might have been spent in enriching and elevating the children of the soil. We have done much but we can do more. It is, however, impossible unless we spend less on the "interests" and more on the people."‡ The development of communications, of irrigation, of education were his methods of benefiting the people of India. Sir William Hunter, the biographer of the Earl of Mayo, the historian of British India and a great Anglo-Indian Administrator, used a description of the Government of India of his time

* Algernon West—The *Indian Administration* of Sir Charles Wood.

† Speech to the Princes and Chiefs of Rajaputana at Ajmere on 1869, quoted in Sir W. W. Hunter's *Life of Earl of Mayo*.

‡ Quoted in *Hunter's Life*.

which sums up the whole policy of the Government of India and is applicable to it from the time of the Earl of Maye up to the present moment. "The Government of India," he says, "is an improving proprietor on an enormous scale." And considering that a goodly number of the Viceroys from Lord Mayo onwards were great and beneficent landlords in England, this theory of the Government of India is not to be wondered at. Lord Mayo himself said: "The Government of India is not only a government but the chief landlord. The duties which in England are performed by a good landlord fall in India in a great measure upon the government."* This idea of benevolent landlordism has influenced the policy of the Government of India ever since. Not only Viceroys but Anglo-Indian administrators, and especially they, have been imbued with this ideal. Take any book written by an Anglo-Indian administrator on India and Indian affairs, and you will find the major portion taken up with a record of the great material progress achieved for India by British rule. The works of Sir George Chesney, Sir John Campbell, Sir John Strachey are taken up with this topic in the main. An analysis of the most typical, and most influential of them, Sir John Strachey's *India, its administration and progress,* shows that of the 25 chapters in the book only two are devoted to the political life of the people and the rest to a description of India, its administration and its material progress. In the works of outside and independent observers like Sir Valentine Chirol and Sir Sydney Low there is more space devoted to Indian politics. But even in them, the authors derive more satisfaction from the work of Englishmen in developing the land of India than in influencing or training the life and character of the people to newer and better ends. This theory of beneveolent proprietorship accounts for the policy of moderate State Socialism to which the Government of India has been prone and which once extorted the admiration of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald. The individualistic views of Sir Bartle Frere, Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council (1859-1862) Governor of Bombay (1862-67), who believed† it to be the appropriate function of government simply "to protect all men in the enjoyment of their rights and possessions so long as they do not interfere with the rights and possessions of others and to remove all obstacles natural or artifical to such enjoyment for it had been his study not to develop Commerce and Industry but to leave Commerce and Industry to develop themselves"*—were exceptional and found a rare and faint echo in the distrust of State interference of a Ripon and a Morley in later years. Even in the Liberal year of 1910 we note the influence of the principles of State Socialism upon the Government of India, for Sir Thomas Holderness, Permanent Under Secretary for India and author of the Home University Library volume on India acknowledges that British rule in India "had to play the part of universal provider and special providence." This theory

* Hunter's *Life of Lord Mayo.*

† Reply to a Public address in Sind in 1859—*Life of Sir Barlle Frere* by Martineau, Vol. I.

accounts for the land policy which till recently looked upon land revenue as rent rather than tax as well as for the famine policy, the irrigation projects, the public works, the preponderantly agricultural interests and the indifferent industrial policy of the Government of India. The main part of Indian policy during the major portion of the history of the Government of India has been to develop the estate of India rather than to build a state in India.

This picture of the materialistic ends of British Government in India has to be relieved by an account of its educational and legal policy. The Government of the Crown in India did not invent its educational policy. It was one of the few respectable legacies of the East India Company. Secretaries of State as well as Viceroys of India and Anglo-Indian administrators of all grades have nobly advanced the cause of education. The main part of the moral progress achieved for India has been through the educational policy of the government. The ideal placed before the Government of India by Lord Palmerston, in the speech* in which he introduced the first Government of India Bill "that it is the duty of this nation to use its power in such a manner as to promote as far as they can the instruction, the enlightenment and the civilisation of the great populations which are now subject to our rule," has been achieved by the Government through education. The "improvement and diffusion of education and the more extended employment of the natives in the public services offer prospects of benefit to the people of India" says Sir George Cornwall Lewis† who next to Burke deserves to be remembered for his terrible indictment of the East India Company. "The most characteristic work of an empire" said Seeley,‡ not only teacher of Cambridge youth but a maker of English public opinion on matters imperial, "is the introduction in the midst of Brahmins of European views of the universe." "We hold in India," he says, "the position not merely of a ruling but of an educating and civilising race." Macaulay's famous minute had decided that the education of India should be through western literature and western sciences and the opening of the three Presidency Universities on the eve of the Mutiny showed that education was to percolate from the classes to the masses of India. The famous "filtration theory" determined the educational policy of the government in the first 50 years of its existence. But here and there a statesmen like the Earl of Mayo felt the need for a more universal system of education. "I dislike this filtration theory," he said,§ "we have done nothing towards extending knowledge to the millions. Let the Baboo learn English by all means. But let me also try to do something towards teaching the three R's to rural Bengal." Although Lord Curzon was an apostle of administrative efficiency and, like his predeces-

* Keith's *Speeches and Documents on Indian Policy*, Volume I.

† *The Government of Dependencies* by Sir George C. Lewis.

‡ Seeley—*Expansion of England*.

§ Letter quoted in Hunter's *Life of the Earl of Mayo*.

sors, an advocate of material progress, pure and simple, there was one element of moral progress by which he laid the greatest store. "If the British dominion," he said in a speech* at the Aligarh College in 1901 "were extinguished tomorrow and if all visible traces of it were to be wiped off the face of the earth, I think that its noblest monument and its proudest spectacle would be the policy which it has adopted in respect of education. We have truly endeavoured to throw wide open the gates of knowledge and to draw the multitudes in," But even so, the end of education according to Lord Curzon was material progress and administrative efficiency. "What is the source of suspicion," he asks at the Educational Conference at Simla in September 1901,† "of superstition, outbreaks, crime—yes, also of much of the agrarian disorder and suffering among the masses. It is ignorance. And what is the only antidote to ignorance? Knowledge." Education as a means of material progress and administrative efficiency, and, at the best, of intellectual culture but not as a means of moral and political progress has been the *motif* of the educational policy of British rule in India. Otherwise, we cannot account for the preponderant attention paid to higher and secondary education and the scanty care devoted to the primary education of the masses till recent times.

Next to education, the contribution of British rule to the moral progress of the people lies in the field of law and justice. "I believe," said Sir Fitzjames Stephen, Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council and maker of English public opinion through his articles in the Reviews, in a speech in the Legislative Council in January 1872‡ "that the real foundation of our power will be found to be an inflexible adherence to broad principles of justice, common to all persons, in all countries and in all ages, and enforced with unflinching firmness in favour of or against everyone who claims the benefit or who presumes to violate them, no matter who he may be" Law, he believed, was the greatest gift of the English to India. "The establishment of a system of law" he says§ "which regulates the most important part of the daily life of a people constitutes in itself a moral conquest more striking, more durable and far more solid than the physical conquest which renders it possible. Our law is, in fact, the sum and substance of what we have to teach them. It is, so to speak, the gospel of the English, and it is a compulsory gospel which admits of no denial and of no disobedience." And the principles of this law "must be European not native, because their ideas about government are wrong" (I am quoting Sir James), they are proved to be wrong by experience which shows that they led to anarchy and demoralisation: and, secondly, because they have produced men and institutions unfit for government."‖ But then

* *Speeches of Lord Curzon* ed. Raliegh Vol. II.

† *Speeches of Lord Curzon,* Vol. II ed. by Raliegh.

‡ Quoted in Leslie Stephen's *Life of Sir James Fitzjames Stephen.*

§ Chapter on Law and Administration of Justice in Hunter's *Life of Lord Mayo.*

‖ Quoted in Leslie Stephen's Life.

if you asked him by what European principles, he would say, "European principles, mean those principles which have been shown by our experience to be essential to peace, order, wealth and progress in arts and sciences" (you see how careful he is to avoid the word liberty) and goes on to say that "all legislation not required for those purposes is mischievous and dangerous." But this adoption of European principles of reform does not carry with it any duty to influence or change the social life or character of the people. "No one can feel more strongly than I do" says Fitjames Stephen, "the madness of the smallest unnecessary interference with the social habits and religious opinion of the country. I would not touch one of them except in cases of extreme necessity." Sir Henry Maine* had to admit that "a nervous fear of altering native custom has ever since the terrible events of 1857 taken possession of Indian administrators." The Etatism of the Government of India was evidently to be limited by a cross-current of Individualism in regard to social matters. But as far the cause of this individualistic restraint one would infer that it arose from fear of offending the religious susceptibilities of the governed rather than from the dry light of principle.

"Une carriere ouverte aux talents" has been a guiding principle of enlightened despotism from the time of the Pharoahs to the time of Napoleon. And that has been the policy of the Government of India, followed indeed with hesitation and doubt, but on the whole continuously and perseveringly. One of the principles asserted by the Proclamation of 1858 was that "so far as may be, our subjects of whatever race or creed be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity duly to discharge." This principle, as is well-known, has not been interpreted by the rulers of India according to the manner of the enlightened despots of Europe. It has been subjected to a special interpretation. The more reputable limitations on a process of what has now been called Indianisation was put in the following words of Sir Henry Summer Maine. "The natives of India," he said, as early as 1887† "desire to have a greater share in the government of the country. So far as these words mean that a certain portion of the native community wishes for easier access to the higher offices in the Queen's service, I will say without touching on some difficult questions which the demand raises, that no rational man will set any limits to its gratification except those imposed by the paramount duties of preserving the safety of the British Indian empire, maintaining the efficiency of its administration, and doing justice to all those classes and races including every variety of intellectual capacity and martial vigour which make up a vast population." The theory that the Civil Service of India recruited by competitive examination in England was the only possible higher executive for India was another limitation on the

* Maine—*Village Communities*, Lect. II.

† Article on India in the *Reign of Queen Victoria*, ed. T. Ward, Vol. I, 1887.

principle of 1858. To Lord Dufferin wrote Lord Northbrook, who was one of the far-seeing statesmen that realised the "absolute necessity" as he calls it of employing Indians wherever possible: "The civil service with all their magnificient qualities have strongly imagined in their minds that no one but an Englishman can do anything, so that, unless I am mistaken, you will find a good deal of quiet opposition to any efforts you may make to employ largely educated natives."* It must be remembered to the credit of Lord Lytton that he was in favour of opening the higher ranks of the administrative service to Indians, although his particular scheme did not prove a success. It must also be remembered that there were civilians like Sir Alfred Lyall who sought "to push the native wherever he could, our only chance of placing government upon a broad and permanent basis."† These views however were exceptional. Sir John Strachey invested the dominant prejudice in regard to the extensive Indianisation of the higher services with the dignity of a theory. "Not the least important part of the competitive examination of the young Englishmen," says Sir John Strachey,‡ "was passed for him by his forefathers who, as we have a right to assume, have transmitted to him not only their physical courage, but the powers of independent judgment, the decision of character, the habits of thought and generally those qualities necessary for the government of men, and which have given us an empire." And he goes on to say that "the only hope for India is the long continuance of the benevolent but strong government of Englishmen." How even good friends of India could be frightened by a policy of Indianisation is illustrated by the well-known opposition of the Marquis of Ripon to the appointment of an Indian to the Governor-General's Executive Council. The policy of Indianisation, like the grant of all political privileges has been looked upon by the rulers of India as a reward for good conduct rather than as a training in political character. They have not acted till recently on the more statesman-like policy of Lord Cromer with whom in Egypt it was a practice "to employ a native wherever it was at all possible in spite of the fact that the native was comparatively inefficient and that a European could do it a vast deal better."

When the rulers of India went beyond the theory of feudal paternalism and of enlightened despotism in the Government of India, they imbued themselves with feelings of general sympathy and regard for the people over whom they were set in authority. "It is necessary," wrote Lord Salisbury to Lord Lytton, "to lay the foundation of some feeling on the part of the coloured races towards the Crown other than the recollection of defeat and the vexation of subjection." But he warns, "there must be no leaving go of the rope of power."§ We have seen how in the writings

* Letter to Lord Dufferin in *Life of Lord Northbook* by Mallet.
† Quoted in Mortimer Durand's *Life of Sir Alfred Lyall.*
‡ *India—its administration and progress.*
§ Letter to Lord Lytton quoted in the *Life of Lord Salisbury* by Lady Gwendolen Cecil, Vol. II.

and utterances of Secretaries of State and Viceroys of India and makers of public opinion there is little or no allusion to "liberty" or "self-government" for the people of India. But fortunately for the growth of political liberty in India, Englishmen are better than their creeds. While repudiating all intention to introduce self-government in the country they have done things and founded institutions which have made the ultimate introduction of the ideas and institutions of liberty inevitable. "The sole moral justification," said Sir Henry Sumner Maine, "for our being in the country at all is the power to improve its institutions." And one of the first acts of the first Secretary of State for India was to pilot an Indian Council Bill through the British Parliament. But the peculiar attitude of English statesmen from the beginning towards these councils was revealed in the decision of Sir Charles Wood that they were to be legislative not deliberative assemblies, consultative, not representative. They were to be established to promote good legislation, not to give the people any voice in the business of legislation. "My intention was," he says speaking of the earlier Council he had established, in 1853, "to give to the Council, i.e., (the Executive Council), the assistance of local knowledge and legal experience in framing laws." He was sorry "that it" thanks curiously enough, to the policy followed by Lord Dalhousie "had turned into a sort of debating society or petty parliament." "I think," he goes on to say, "that the general opinion both in India and in England condemned the action of the Council when it attempted to discharge functions other than those that I have mentioned, when it constituted itself a body for the redress of grievances and engaged in discussion" And he quotes Sir Lawrence Peel, Vice-President of the Council as saying "it has no jurisdiction in the nature of that of a general inquest of the nation. Its functions are purely legislative and are limited even in that respect. It is not an Anglo-Indian House of Commons for the redress of grievances, to refuse supplies and so forth."* Sir Charles Wood's own objection to the establishment of a parliamentary assembly in India was the physical difficulty "of assembling at any one place in India persons who shall be the representatives of the various classes of the native population of that empire, and that the natives who are resident in the towns no more represent the rural native population than a highly educated native of London at the present day represents a highland chieftain or a feudal baron of half a dozen centuries ago."†

The assertion that the Legislative Councils of India are not to develop into parliaments and that the fostering of self-government forms no part of the mission of British rule in India is repeated time and again in the public utterances and private communications of the rulers of India ever since Sir Charles Wood laid the foundations of the policy of the Government of India under the Crown. Liberals, with one remarkable exception,

* Speech of Sir Charles Wood in Keith—*Speeches and Documents of Indian Policy*, Volume I.

† *ibid.*

and Conservatives have harped on the same tune. Sir Henry Sumner Maine, before being Legal Member of the Governor-General's Executive Council in 1862, had been a "Saturday Review" writer on Indian questions during the time of the settlement of the Government of India after the Mutiny. In 1887, he contributed an article to a book called the *Reign of Queen Victoria* on India which sums up the views on Indian Government which he held as a member of the supreme government in India in the year 1862-1869, and later adviser of Secretaries of State on the India Council in the period 1873-1888. While expressing his sympathy with the aspirations of the educated classes to power and greater association with Englishmen in the government of the country, he believed that popular government was impossible in India. His chief reason for this view was characteristic. Taking his stand on "the most important fact about India which, if taken as a whole, is number," he says that the vast population of India is a formidable obstacle to the introduction of popular government in the country. "It is impossible," he says, "to look over those figures (of the population of India) without observing that when a State, held together by the same political institutions, contains a population at all resembling that of India in multitudousness, these institutions are strictly despotic. Popular governments are confined to considerably smaller communities. There is no reason to suppose it possible that 200 or 250 millions could govern themselves or enforce responsibility on the part of these governing them." "These, he concludes epigrammatically are the "astronomical measure of politics." He goes on to say that popular government in India would mean class government. "Let me add," he says, "that, if the effect of employing in an eastern society the political mechanism growing into favour in the West were to lift into administrative or legislative supremacy a small group of men numbering 5,000 or 10,000 or 15,000 or a particular caste, or race, or class educated in a particular way, the government thus established might have merits or demerits but it could not without violent straining of language be called popular government or a democracy." He requires, like most Anglo-Indian critics of Indian reforms, a wide extent of literacy and a high degree of education and compares modern India to medieval Europe—as if literacy was widespread in the city-states of the Middle Ages or as if the knights and burgesses of Lancastrian parliaments were highly educated gentlemen. But with the happy inconsequence of Englishmen, Sir Henry Maine advocated the introduction of representative institutions which "are in strict accordance" he says "neither self-government nor responsible government, but appear to do something to gratify aspirations which are constantly growing up in the more elevated minds of every race."

The arguments against the introduction of popular self-government put in such refined and academic language by Sir Henry Maine are put forward in varying degrees of refinement and logic by others. Lord Salisbury was frankly hostile to the educated classes who demanded political

progress. "They," he said, "could not be anything else than opposition in quiet times, rebels in times of trouble."* And looking into the future he could imagine no more terrible prospect for India than that of being governed by "competitive labour." Although he was willing to make "the princes and aristocracy partners in the guardianship of the frontiers, the commercial interests, the external resources of the empire, in the maintenance of the blessings of peace and of friendly relations with the various powers, who lie upon its borders and are nourished by its trade," he would not allow the Council of Princes advocated by Lord Lytton "to look upon itself as a machine for checking or guiding you and in some measure *them* in the dealings of the empire with those who lie without it." Benjamin Jowett, the teacher of Indian Civil servants and mentor of Indian Viceroys who believed that "nothing is more important in India than Sanitation from the point of view not only of health but of wealth and there is nothing of which the natives are less intelligent,"† was of opinion that what India wanted was not representative government but good government. "We may do a great deal in India," he says writing to Lord Lansdowne, Viceroy of India,‡ "by (1) securing the allegiance of the native princes, (2) by conferring benefits on the masses such as sanitation, irrigation, the prevention of famine, the improvement of agriculture, (3) by admitting them to a somewhat larger share of administration." But "whenever we admit them to representation" he moans "they will flood and drown us." This view was modified in a later letter when he says "I hope that representation will in some form be granted them not merely by nomination but by election." as he could not see how after the introduction of a free press, English education and communication with England it was possible to keep back representation." But his motive for the conversion was not a desire for the establishment of a popular government, but because "we must know the native mind and feelings."

Mr. Bryce (later Lord Bryce) was more positive than the famous Master of Balliol in his opposition to the introduction of popular institutions in India. His starting point was the view that English Government in India was a military government. "The fact" he says in one of his *Studies in History and jurisprudence*, "that their dominions were acquired by force of arms exerted an enduring effect upon the Roman Empire and continues to exert it upon the British in imprinting upon their rules in India a permanently military character........ The English in India are primarily soldiers.............Society

---

* Letter to Lord Lytton quoted in Lady Gwendolen Cecil's *Life*.

† Letter to Lord Lansdowne in *Letters of Benjamin Jowett* ed. by Abbott and Campbell.

‡ *ibid.*

in India is Military Society. The traveller from peaceful England feels himself except perhaps in Bombay surrounded by an atmosphere of gunpowder all the time he is in India." "While" he acknowledges "the idea that the government of subject races is to be regarded as a trust to be discharged with a view of responsibility to God and to humanity at large has becoming generally accepted," he has to admit that there was under Rome and that there is in British India "no room for popular institutions or for popular interference with the acts of rulers from the Viceroy down to a district official." These views of Mr. Bryce are not merely statements of historical fact but personal convictions for he thinks that "this was and is by the nature of the case inevitable" and because "India has had no sort of experience of self-government on a scale larger than that of the village council.*

However that may be, the spread of education, especially of higher education weighed with many an English statesmen called upon to rule India from England or in India as an argument for political progress. "Now that we have educated these people," said Lord Dufferin in a Minute he wrote as Viceroy, "their desire to take a larger share in the management of their own domestic affairs seems to be a legitimate and reasonable aspiration, and I think there should be enough statesmanship among us to evolve the means of permitting them to do so without unduly compromising our imperial supremacy."† But, whatever is done, "England should never abdicate her supreme control of public affairs or delegate to a minority or to a class the duty of providing for the welfare of the diversified communities over which she rules." In a speech‡ at St. Andrews dinner on 30th November, 1888, he elaborated his views on self-government for India, thus:—"The small number of the educated class—this microscope minority as he called it—can hardly be representative of the people of India. In the present condition of India there can be no real or effective representation of the people with "their enormous numbers, their multifarious interests and their tesselated nationalities. When all the strength, power, and intelligence of the British Government are applied to the prevention of one race, of one interest, of one class, of one religion dominating another it would be impossible to think of popular government." And he recommended the Indian National Congress which had just then been founded to confine itself to social and economic reform. British rulers of India have echoed this opposition to the introduction of representative government ever afterwards till just the other day. "I always felt said Lord George Hamilton, Secretary of State for India, 1895-1904 that "the more we raised the status of prosperity and the standard of efficient government, in India, under Pax Brittannica, the stronger would be the demand for self-government," "It is a demand" he acknowledges "to which if India were in any sense homogeneous, there would be but one reply; but India is not homo-

* *Studies in History and Jurisprudence.* Volume I.

† Minute quoted in Lyall's *Life of Lord Dufferin.*

‡ Speeches of Lord Dufferin.

geneous,'' and he goes on to say ''that the idea of government through the majority is wholly contrary to the instinct and traditions of Indian psychology.''*

The ideas of Lord Curzon on Indian political reform are well-known. But it must be said to his credit that they were not formed after his stay in India as Viceroy but informed his speeches and actions when he was Under Secretary of State for India in the period (1891-1892). He also like Sir Charles Wood was called upon to pilot an Indian Councils Bill through the House of Commons which became the Indian Councils Act of 1893. But the arguments seem to have advanced slightly beyond those of Sir Charles Wood. ''The object of this Bill,'' said the Hon'ble G. N. Curzon† as he then was, ''is to widen the basis and to expand the functions of government in India: to give fuller opportunities than at present exist to the non-official and native element in Indian society to take part in the work of government and in this way to lend official recognition to that remarkable development both of political interest and of political capacity which has been visible among the higher classes of Indian society since the Government of India was taken over by the Crown in 1858.'' But the idea that these Legislative Councils are superior legislative machinery not institutions of popular government still persists. Mr. Curzon acknowledges that there are few better legislative machines than those Indian Legislative Councils but takes care to assert that ''they are in no sense of the term parliamentary bodies.'' They were to make financial criticism public and responsible and to bring public responsible opinion to bear upon the administration. The idea was evidently to organise a direct and efficient rival to the Press and the Public Meeting. Lord Curzon in India was only a development of the Hon'ble G. N. Curzon. His principles of government were those of his predecessors, beneficent paternalism achieved through administrative efficiency. The welfare of the Indian poor, of the Indian peasant, ''the patient humble silent millions, the 80 per cent who subsist by agriculture'' ''the real Indian people'' was the object of all his famous measures of government as he proclaimed to the world in his farewell speech at the Byculla Club on November 16, 1905. He always held like Frederick the Great of Prussia that ''governors are servants of the public.'' How nobly he spent himself in his attempt to achieve this ideal is written in the annals of Indian administration. But his manual of government was incomplete. He would do nothing for the training of the people in self-government. Not that he had not the time nor the energy for this task. He simply had not the will. In that same Byculla Club speech‡ he said ''That I have not offered political concessions is because I do not regard it as wisdom or statesmenship in the interests of India to do so.'' This frank avowal of his policy is remarkable because he asserted that one of his principles of government had been ''every where to look ahead, to scrutinise not merely the pressing needs of the hour but the abiding needs of the country and to build not for the present but for the

* Lord George Hamilton—*Parliamentary Reminiscences.*

† Speech in Keith—*Speeches and Documents on Indian Policy.*

‡ Speeches of Lord Curzon ed. by Raliegh, Vol. II.

future." What his idea of building for the future was may be gathered from the following passage which may be taken as his "apologia pro vita sua" in India. "To leave India financially stronger and more prosperous, to have added to the elements of stability in the national existence, to have cut out some sources of impurity or corruption, to have made dispositions that will raise the level of administration not for a year or two but continuously, to have uplifted the people a few grades in the scale of well-being, to have enabled the country and the government better to confront the dangers and vicissitudes of the future, that is" he said "the statesman's ambition." It was, however, an incomplete statesman that had no eye for the conditions and problems that had been created by the system of higher education, a free press, an alert public opinion, a fairly representative council, institutions and conditions of which Lord Curzon himself made excellent use.

Not only Viceroys and Secretaries of State, but Anglo-Indian administrators, men on the spot, have contributed to the stiffening of English official and public opinion against the introduction of the ideas and institutions of self-government in India. Sir George Chesney was one of the first Anglo-Indian administrators to publish their opinions on the Government of India. In the last chapter of his book on Indian Polity which is all that he devotes of the 22 chapters in the book to the question of political progress he deals with this particular problem of Indian Government. He is of opinion that the country is not and will not be for an indefinite time fit for representative institutions. Although "he says," it must nevertheless be governed in accordance with the wishes of the people so far as they can be ascertained and are compatible with the maintenance of British rule," he has nothing but contempt for the educated classes, the Indian National Congress and their aims. "A wise government and growing prosperity "are the two ends he has in view for India. The opinions of Sir John Strachey are more typical of Anglo-Indian opinion. Here is what he thinks on political reform in India. His opposition to the introduction of the institutions of self-government in India is based on the absence of nationality in the country. India, he says* is "a multitude of different communities, the difference between the countries of Europe are undoubtedly smaller than those between the countries of India. The growth of a single nationality in India is impossible. "However long may be the duration of our dominion, however, powerful may be the centralising attraction of our government, or the influence of the common interests which grow up" "he is positive that no such results can follow." This view of the Anglo-Indian administrator had curiously enough been anticipated by that shining light of Victorian liberalism John Bright who asks† "Does any man with the smallest glimmering of common sense believe that so great a country with its 20 different nations and 20 different languages can ever be bound up and consolidated into one compact and enduring empire?" Strachey's objection to self-government apart from

* Strachey's *India*.

† Speeches of John Bright, Vol. II.

the racial prejudice I have already referred to is based on distrust of the educated classes. "It would be the beginning of the end of our empire "he says" if we were to forget this elementary fact and were to entrust the greater executive power in the hands of natives on the assumption that they will always be faithful and strong supporters of our government." For the supreme task of government in India is the preservation of the "unbreakable blessings" of the Pax Brittanica.*

Milder and more reputable is the argument against free institutions in India of Lord Cromer once Finance Member of Lord Ripon's executive council, later maker of modern Egypt, elder statesman of England, and moulder of the public opinion of the governing classes in England in regard to imperial matters. "Free institutions in the full sense of the terms" says Lord Cromer† "must for generations to come be wholly impossible to countries such as India and Egypt. It will probably never be possible to make a western silk-purse out of an eastern sow's ear." At all events "if the impossibility of the task be called in question" it should be recognised that "the process of manufacture will be extremely lengthy and tedious." "Parliamentary government although the only method which has yet been invented for mitigating the evils attendant on the personal system of government and is a good method" it is "thoroughly uncongenial to oriental habits of thought." Two principles only, says Lord Cromer may avert the fate of the Roman empire from the British. The one is that local revenues should be expended locally and the other is that over-centralisation should above all things be avoided and he bends so far as to say that this may be done by the creation of self-governing institutions in those dependencies whose civilisation is sufficiently advanced to justify the adoption of this course. But he never gives up the view that parliamentary institutions are unsuited to oriental peoples. His golden rule for the government of a dependency is the materialistic view of the Free trader and Cobdenite. "The leading principle of a government of this nature, "he says" should be that low taxation is the most potent instrument with which to compose discontent. He condemned the periodical assessment of land revenue in British India, comparing it to the Roman Indiction, as well as the excessive military expenditure and forward frontier policy of the Government of India. Militarism and commercial egotism are the great enemies, in Lord Cromer's opinion, of Imperial Rule. Another great Anglo-Indian Administrator Sir Alfred Lyall also thought that moderate taxation was "the sheet anchor of British rule in India." In regard to Indianisation and widening of the Legislative Councils Sir Alfred Lyall went further than the older run of Anglo-Indian Administrators. But even he believed that in the subconscious mentality of the Indian people, bureaucracy holds the place which self-government occupies with us," and threw out the disturbing argument "that Indian spirituality is against the ideas and institutions of self-government."‡

---

* Strachey—*India.*
† *Political and Literary Essay*—First Series.
‡ Mortimer Durand's *Life of Sir Alfred Lyall.*

The tale of the views of Anglo-Indian administrators on political reform may be closed with the opinion of Sir Thomas Holderness, Permanent-Under-Secretary of State for India for a number of years, and author of the book on India* in the Home University Library. "The policy of the British in India in regard to constitutional reform" he says "has been to associate the people of India with the government more and more closely as time and circumstances permitted while maintaining the common interest of India and England, the *strength and unity of the executive power"*, A constitutional reform dominated by this idea cannot be expected to be full-blooded and when it is remembered that this utterance is dated 1910 one realises that by that time there had not been much progress in the opinion of Anglo-Indian official circles since the first days of the Government of India under the Crown.

If from Conservative Secretaries of State and practical Viceroys and administrators, we turn to Liberal statesmen we find them smoking the same brand of political opinion. During the period of British rule in India under the Crown from 1858 Conservative Ministries were in power most of the time except for a few years as in the memorable Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon or the mediocre Secretaryship of Sir Henry Fowler, and the supreme opportunity of Liberalism to imprint its mark upon the Government of India did not come till 1905 when the Liberals came into power to stay there for an unbroken period of nearly 10 years and when John Morley, the hierophant of Liberalism, was appointed to the India office. The normal views of Liberal statesmen were summed up by Sir Henry Fowler when as Secretary of State he said in a speech on Indian affairs reported in the *Times* of 8th February 1895. "The policy of England in India is in one word to develop the resources agricultural, mineral, manufacturing and commercial of that vast empire, to preserve to the Indian people the priceless privilege of the nation's guarantee of the individual freedom, the individual liberty, the individual right of every subject of the Queen, to uphold a rigid, stern, unbending impartiality in the administration of justice and to defend the people of India from the calamity of foreign wars and the still greater curse of intestine civil war." English Liberalism till the other day never went beyond the guaranteeing of the negative passive rights of free citizenship in India. And Lord Morley's career as Secretary of State illustrates the view gathered from the history of Liberalism in many countries besides England that Liberalism stands rather for Equality than for Liberty. When John Morley came to the India office, he could not have got much guidance from his master John Stuart Mill in regard to the Government of India for that master, the former Examiner of Indian correspondence in the India House and defender of the East India Company, was more concerned with the constitution of the English portion of the Government and believed that the whole secret of Indian Government lay "in the personal qualities and capacities of the agents of Government" that England sent out to India.† Lord

* Published in 1910.

† See *Representative Government, Ch. XVIII.*

Morleys introduction of Indians into the Viceroy's executive Council and the India Council in the teeth of opposition from the highest and least expected quarters was not merely a dramatic but a real assertion and a supreme and effective assertion of the principle of a career open to talent, exactly 50 years after the principle was first proclaimed. But in regard to liberty and self-government he was not so free and bold. Liberal that he was, he hesitated to use the instrument of deportation and to limit the freedom of the press, and cursed, Hamlet-wise, the times in which his lot was cast. He allowed the creation of more representative councils and endowed them with much greater powers of criticism and control over the executive than they had possessed before. But he never envisaged the Minto-Morley Councils as they have been called in India as incipient parliaments. He like Lord Curzon and Lord Cromer believed that English institutions were unsuitable to India. "Not one whit more than you do" he wrote to Lord Minto, "I think it tenable or possible or even conceivable to adapt English political institutions to the nations who inhabit India. Assuredly not in your day or mine."* Speaking in the House of Lords on the 17th December 1908 in introducing his Reform proposals he said "If it could be said that what I propose would lead directly up to the establishment of a parliamentary system in India, I for one would have nothing at all to do with it." To Lord Curzon's doctrine of efficiency Lord Morley could only oppose his doctrine of political concessions to agitation. He believed more in egalitarian than liberal reform. "I half suspect," he wrote about the political classes "that what they really want a million times beyond political reforms is access to the higher administrative posts of all sorts, though they are alive to the inseparable connection between the two." His principles of Indian Government are laid down in the following words which seem an echo of Sir Henry Sumner Maine and Sir James Fitzjames Stephen's view. "What are we in India for," he asks and answers, "Surely in order to implant sternly, prudently, judiciously those ideas of justice, law, humanity which are the foundation of our institutions."

Not very different from official opinion was non-official opinion in England in regard to the principles of Indian Government. The non-official English writer in England whom we need taken into account is the journalistic correspondent of a great newspaper such as the *Times* for it is he, beside retired Viceroys and Governors and Indian Civil Service men, that moulds public opinion among the governing classes in England. The articles on Indian Affairs in the *Times* newspaper may be taken as typical of non-official opinion in England. As the student turns over the pages of successive bound volumes of the *Times* he is struck by the similarity of the subject matter of these articles to that of the topics which occupied the minds of Anglo-Indian statesmen. Currency and Exchange, the Finances of India, Cotton, Tea and Jute Industries, the prospects of agriculture, and Famine, Railways and Sanitation and Irrigation—they cover the whole range of material progress of India. When the *Times* gets beyond that range it restricts itself to Education and Archaelogy! Rare indeed

* Letter: in *Recollections*, Volume II.

are the articles on political reform and progress. And when they do occur, they further more or less the views of official opinion. The following views taken from a leading article in the *Times* of December 30, 1897 on the Indian National Congress are typical. "We cannot pretend" says the *Times* "to govern India in accordance with the principles of parliamentary theory....The masses of the Indian people are absolutely incapable of self-government in any shape and they would not quietly submit to be governed by natives, even if natives who possessed elementary qualifications for the business of government were to be found in sufficient numbers. Until the majority of educated natives give better proofs of their fitness for legislative and administrative duties (than recently in the management of the Poona sewage) it does not seem at all likely and it certainly is most undesirable that any government should accept the tremendous responsibility of tampering with the traditions of our system in India. Attempt upon the part of the Congress to reserve for themselves a predominant part in framing the laws and still more a decisive share in the control of the purse will never be accepted by politicians of Empire." Although, arguing against the policy of a South African Government only a year before the same *Times* newspaper in an article* on British Indian subjects in South Africa had said "There is probably no other country in the world in which representative institutions have penetrated so deeply into the life of the people. Every caste, every trade, every village in India had for ages its Council of Five which practically legislated for and conducted the administration of the little community which it represented." This powder and shot was evidently kept for use against a common enemy. But in the domestic controversy between England and India, the *Times* till recently, in common with the bulk of English opinion, would never accept the view that English parliamentary government could be acclimatised in India. Nor have other English papers been taught better by their correspondents or contributors. In a later day Sir Sydney Low's *Vision of India*† once recommended by Mr. Morley to members of the House of Commons as the best introduction to a study of Indian affairs is an impressionist picture of India as it is rather than a vision of what India ought to be. He is not afraid of Swadeshi in economics as in politics for he does not fear "that it will be fatal to our political predominance, so long as our military strength remains unimpaired and so long as we retain control of the supreme administration." Impracticable as he thinks the ideal of Dominion Self-Government may be, he is just sympathetic enough not to dismiss it brusquely as a mere fantasy best treated with ridicule or contempt. Sir Valentine Chirol who, as the special correspondent and Indian Editor of the *Times* has for nearly 20 years moulded the opinion of the *Times* on Indian Affairs, while sympathetic to Indian political aspirations in his first book on *Indian Unrest* which indeed was a collection of articles he had contributed from India to the paper in 1908-1909, thinks that "our object therefore, both in the education and political training of Indians should be to direct the activities of the new Western educated classes into economic channels which would broaden their own horizon" and "to give greater encouragement

* Jan. 31, 1896—Weekly edition.

† Published in 1906.

and recognition to the interests of the very large and influential classes that hold entirely aloof from politics but look to us for guidance and help in the development of the material resources of the country.'' He advocates the affording of increased opportunities of military employment to the Indians. But he is suspicious of democratic government. He thinks that any proposals for the introduction of democratic government in British India should not be entertained without the approval of Indian princes on whose States such experiments may have an uncomfortable reaction. ''When we talk of governing India,'' he says, ''in accordance with Indian ideas we cannot exclude the ideas of very representative and influential classes of Indians to which none are better qualified to give expression than the ruling chief.'' His final word in regard to constitutional changes is that these are not so important as educational reform, industrial development, the promotion of an enlightened sense of self-interest'' and that ''the absence of the bonds of kinship which tie England to the Dominions, bonds which cannot be artificially forged, makes it impossible that we should ever concede to India the rights of self-government which we have willingly conceded to the great British communities of our own race.''

It is unnecessary to continue any further the tale of this section of English opinion which has determined the policy of the Government of India. Feudal paternalism, political materialism, the reign of law, justice and humanity, the principle of equality, an open career to talent form the main threads of this strand of English political thought so far as it affected the Government of India. That this body of political theory has done great and useful and lasting work for India no student of history or of politics will deny. It created an atmosphere of peace and tranquility so necessary for the development of political life. It secured the building of administrative efficiency without which constitutional reform would be a delusion and a snare. It ensured the development of the material resources and the forging of the material bonds of unity so that political progress may become easy. But still, in spite of all its beneficent work, it forms but an incomplete philosophy of government. Neither political materialism nor administrative mechanics, nor egalitarian justice can describe the whole political duty of Englishmen in India. Fortunately for the full development of political character in India, and, if I may say so, fortunately for the political reputation of Englishmen, there was another strand of political thought not so thick as the first but still running in and out and hanging on till it grew and became as important as the other. The threads of that other strand of English political thought I hope to unravel to-morrow.

We have seen with what care the words "liberty" and "self-government" were avoided in the formal and private pronouncements, whether of Secretaries of State, or Viceroys, or Anglo--Indian administratos. If they were mentioned at all, it was to repudiate them as the ends of Indian government. When institutions or privileges were granted from time to time, which contained the seeds of the promise of self-government, it was expressly asserted that that was not to be considered as the end and purpose of those awards. They were to be considered as nothing more than concessions to the political agitation of the educated classes, which had to be placated only as a means to good government. While, as for the view that British rule in India offered a splendid opportunity for the political education of the people of India unto the highest end of government, which is freedom, it does not seem to have entered the heads of the rulers of India till about the other day. Not "political education" but "political concessions" has been the watchword of whatever measure in the direction of popular government has proceeded from the best of the rulers of India. But there have been a few notable exceptions even in the period of feudal paternalism in British Indian history. The only Englishman in the early days of that period who (as far as I am able to find out) was not afraid of uttering the words "liberty" and "self-government" in connection with the Government of India, was Sir George Otto Trevelyan. It, perhaps, came natural to the nephew of Lord Macaulay to say, as he did in that great Anglo-Indian classic, the "*Competitionwallah*" which appeared in 1864 that "Englishmen would be very glad to see the quays of Liverpool heaped with bales of Bombay cotton, but they had far rather behold the continent of India covered with a thriving, intelligent, *free* population who owe to our just and enlightened sway the blessings of civilisation, of education, and of *liberty*." And long before the time of the "Friends of India," he poured the vials of his irony and sarcasm and anger on the attempt of the indigo planters to have a criminal contract law passed for their benefit. After Trevelyan there were Anglo-Indian statesmen here and there who felt that all was not sound in the orthodox British intentions in regard to India. Lord Mayo's work for municipal and local self-government in India is well-known and he was statesmanlike enough to envisage these institutions as a training in self-government. It is surprising to find a Viceroy like Lord Lytton giving expression to a suspicion that all was not well with Anglo-Indian Government. But then Lord Lytton was an original observer who could put his finger on some of the weaknesses of the government he was called upon to administer. He will be remembered for that brilliant but shrewd criticism that "the Government of India is a government by dispatch-box tempered by an occasional loss of keys." But more pertinent for our purpose is the following criticism of the Govern-

ment of India as he found it. "I am convinced," he said, in a letter to Lord Salisbury, May, 11, 1876* "that the fundamental political mistake of able and experienced Indian officials is a belief that we can hold India securely by what they call good government; that is to say, by improving the condition of the ryot, strictly administering justice, by spending immense sums on irrigation works. Politically speaking the Indian peasantry is an inert mass. If it ever moves at all, it will move in obedience not to its British benefactors, but to its natural chiefs and princes, however tyrannical, they may be." Even to an Anglo-Indian administrator like Sir George Campbell a vision other than that vouchsafed to his brethren was given. "The summary of the view to which I incline"† he writes in the 80's of the last century "is that the natives are not yet prepared for political freedom on a large scale such as we understand it, whatever they may be hereafter, but we must concede much to their legitimate aspirations and to the necessity of the case. The only question is how much and in what direction and the answer I give is—local self-government wisely and well planned and then left to work with real freedom; the object being to let the people bear their own burdens and educate themselves for higher things rather than to attain at once a local government without faults and blemishes." But it was not till the coming of Lord Ripon as Viceroy of India in 1880 that the speeches, resolutions and acts of a Governor-General of India for the first time became charged with the inspiration of liberty and self-government.

Already as private member of the House of Commons, Lord Ripon had shown his inclination towards sympathy and generosity in affairs of Indian government in a speech on 20th May, 1858 when he set up a spirited defence of Clemency Canning and celebrated "the name given in derision as his highest title and honour." As soon as he arrived in India, he lost no time in making known to the Home authorities his principles and methods of government in India. Writing on the Russian menace and the frontier policy he tells the Secretary of State for India that the best defence of India lies in good government. "How can such intrigues (like the Russian) "he asks in a letter‡ to Lord Hartington "be best met and defeated? The despatch of December 1880 gives the best true answer. By good government and the development of the resources of the country." Lord Ripon was not a mere vissionary but looked to the material foundations of the fabric of Indian government as a study of his administration will show. He prepared the mind of the Home Government for his great measure of reform when in the same letter he said "there is a tide in the affairs of men here just now which if we seize it at the flood may enable us to do much in a comparatively short space of time."

* Personal and literary letters of Lord Lytton ed. by Lady Betty Balfour Volume II.

† The British Empire—Sir George Campbell 1887.

‡ Quoted in Wolff's *Life of the Marquis of Ripon.*

Nor was he a mere liberal doctrinaire. It is amusing to find him accusing Major Baring, the future Lord Cromer of being doctrinaire "as I think" he says "a doctrinaire policy dangerous in India." In view of the great popularity he attained among the people of India it is worth noting that he wrote to a friend: "Popularity is worth nothing unless it can be used as an engine to enable the government to do good work: and if it is to be diminished or to be lost in fighting the battles of the poor cultivators of the soil (Lord Curzon's sympathy for the ryot was anticipated by the predecessor whom he repudiated) it is not worth retaining for an hour." Lord Ripon was, as I have already pointed out, the first ruler of India to look upon British rule as a means of political education for the people of the country. In fact it is in his famous Resolution on local self-government that the phrase, as far as I know, appears for the first time. That resolution* contained these words: "It is not primarily with a view to improvement in administration that the measure is put forward and supported. It is chiefly desirable as an instrument of *political and popular education.*" Elsewhere in the same document he says. "The problem is that of discussing in what measure the people of the towns and districts in British India can be best trained to manage their own local affairs, intelligently and successfully." I look upon the extension of self-government" he said on another occasion "as the best means at the disposal of the Government of India at the present time of promoting and extending the political education of the people of this country." "I would ask" he says "those whose favourite schemes may be thwarted or opposed to remember that the establishment, development and practical working of self-government is in itself a great benefit to the country: that it is not only an end to be pursued but a great object of political education to be attained and that one may well put up with disappointment and annoyance rather than sweep away those institutions which are calculated in the end as they become better understood and as the people become more accustomed to work them to confer large benefits upon the community in general." To this end he was willing to introduce an elective element in the Imperial and Provincial Legislative Councils, but like the practical statesman that he was, he abandoned it for the policy of developing local self-government and was content to build the foundations on which his successors could raise the superstructure. His practical statesmanship was exhibited in another important subject of policy and I would like to emphasise this aspect of it as it became almost a commonplace of Anglo-Indian history and political criticism to dismiss Lord Ripon as a scatter-brained radical doctrinaire. He was the first to discern the intimate and necessary connection between elementary education and any scheme of self-government. "I think" he told a generation that was enthusiastic about higher education and looked to filtration to bring about the enlightenment of the masses "that the time has come for paying attention to

* Speeches and Published Resolutions ed. by R. C. Palit, Calcutta, 1886.

the education of the masses." "I attach" he said, "a special and very particular importance to the spread of popular education." In the Resolution on the Education Commission of 1882, Lord Ripon says: "It is the desire of the Governor-General in Council that the Commission should especially bear in mind the great importance which the Government attaches to primary education, and that the principal object therefore of the enquiry should be the present state of elementary education, throughout the empire and the means by which this can everywhere be extended and improved." In that same resolution, he pleads for freedom and self-government in matters of educational organisation. He adjures Indian philanthropists and organisations to develop higher and secondary education through the grant-in-aid system "as it is chiefly in this way that the native community will be able to secure that freedom and variety of education which is an essential condition in any social and complete educational system." And he links up education with self-government when he says. "It is especially the wish of government that municipal bodies should take a large and increasing share in the management of the public schools within the limits of their jurisdiction." He hopes that the funds that will thus be set free will be devoted to the education of the masses. In regard to the problem of Indian nationality he was neither sceptical about its development like John Bright nor afraid of it like Seeley, who had said* "If by any process, the population should be included into a single nationality ....then do not say we ought to begin to fear for our dominion: I say we ought to cease at once to hope for it." Evidently the gospel of the Lost Dominion is not a new one. Long before Lord Curzon, and I say this with no disparagement to the indisputably magnificent work of the later Viceroy in this respect, Lord Ripon realised the political possibilities of Indian archaeology. "I desire," he said† in reply to an address from the Agra Municipality "that that history and those monuments should be appreciated by the people of India and that the national art and the national feeling of which these monuments are the beautiful outcome should be cherished and preserved. I have no jealousy of any such feelings."

It would have been well, indeed, for India if the thin stream of the Ripon ideal of Indian government had swollen into a river of thought as broad at least as that of the other idea of administrative efficiency and political materialism. But, unfortunately, Ripon's ideals were discredited by the agitation that circled round the Ilbert Bill. Although Lord Ripon believed that "these proposals (of the Ilbert Bill) would completely remove from the law all distinctions based on the race of the judge "yet in order not to imperil the greater schemes he had in view he would, we now know from his letters, have been willing to withdraw the measure if he had had only a faint glimmering idea of the tremendous opposition it was

* Seeley—Expansion of England.

† Lord Ripon's Speeches and Addresses.

going to raise. But for the fact that an absent-minded Secretary of State put Sir Henry Maine's note of warning about the possibility of a fierce agitation in India into his great-coat pocket and went off to Newmarket and promptly forgot all about it, it is almost certain that the Ilbert Bill would have been withdrawn and the great ideals of Lord Ripon might have been saved from the disrepute into which they fell. From the time of Lord Ripon's departure for India till about a decade ago his idea of British rule as a means of political and popular education towards the end of self-government was lost to the memory of the rulers of India. It found an echo here and there in the observations of independent advanced English politicians and students of Indian politics like Sir Alfred Lyall and Mr. Ramsay Macdonald. "My view of the situation," wrote Lyall to Lord Cromer in 1909,* "is that the present bureaucratic system of government though it is the best method of securing efficient administration cannot long be maintained. But at the present time we perceive everywhere in Asia the beginning of a movement towards giving the higher classes a larger share in the government of their respective countries, towards bringing men of capacity and competence into the upper ranks of administration and investing them with some power of exerting their influence on the course of affairs........I am convinced that the introduction of Indians to places of real and high influence in Government is a step that must be taken sooner or later........and I should propose to take it sooner than later." Mr. Ramsay Macdonald paid two visits to India and has embodied the results of his reflection at close quarters of the problem of India in two books. In the earlier work the "*Awakening of India*" published in 1910 although he does not advocate great constitutional changes he pleads for a new spirit in the government. "Efficiency," he says, "is not better than self-government." He believes that the future belongs to nationalism in India, and that giving "wide liberty to govern herself is the only way to abiding peace and to the fulfilment of our work in India." In the later book, *The Government of India* he is even more positive in stating the mission of England in India for "unless the British political genius is to change fundamentally for the worse, the British conquest is to issue in Indian liberty and self-government." "We must now begin" he says and let us remember that the book was written some time before it was published in 1920 "with self-government set clearly before us, our definitely promised goal and in reconstructing Councils and Civil service, we must grant powers which give Indians a responsible share in their own government." But the influence of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald's views on the rulers of India could not have been great when the books were published as he was only a Labour M. P. and Labour had not the power it has since become. Nor to Mr. William Archer another independent observer had Indian self-government any terrors, for he says "it is bound to come about automatically as soon as the country is intellectually

* Quoted in Durand's *Life of Sir Alfred Lyall.*

morally and socially prepared for it'' and he urges the view that ''our rule is a means and not an end'' and recognises that Indians cannot be expected to co-operate loyally in measures confessedly devoted to perpetual enthralment.''*

These voices were stray voices in the wilderness. They had little or no effect on the administration. The utmost that even the most liberal Secretaries of State after Ripon like Lord Morley and Viceroys like Lord Minto and Lord Hardinge did was to grant political concessions to agitation. There is a new note in the writings and speeches of Lord Minto and Lord Hardinge which served as a striking contrast to the tone of Lord Curzon who had treated the educated political classes as of little account in his scheme of Indian government. In the Viceroyalty of Lord Minto the Government of India thinks it is its duty to take into account the political feelings of the educated classes. ''But we the Government of India,'' says Lord Minto in his Minute of August 1906, ''cannot shut our eyes to present conditions. The political atmosphere is full of change, questions are before us which we cannot afford to ignore and which we must attempt to answer and to me it would appear to be all important that the initiative should emanate from us, that the Government of India should not be put in the position of appearing to have its hands forced by agitation in this country or by pressure from Home, that we should be the first to recognise surrounding conditions and to place before His Majesty's Government the opinions which personal experience and a close touch with the everyday life of India entitle us to hold.'' This new note must be explained as firstly a reaction against Lord Curzon's policy of turning the blind eye to things he did not like and to Lord Minto's own character of a realist determined to see things as they are, and of a brave sportsman whom obstacles could not turn from the winning post. His political motto borrowed from the race-course was, ''wait in front.'' We now know from Mr. John Buchan's *Life* that Lord Minto as early as March 1906 entertained the idea of ''appointing an Indian to the membership of the Executive Council since to him the path of executive partnership between the races seemed the simplest and most hopeful.''† ''The truth is'' he wrote‡ in a letter to Lord Morley in February 1907'' that by far the most important factor we have to deal with in the political life of India is not impossible Congress ambitions but the growing strength of an educated class which is perfectly loyal and moderate in its views but which I think quite justly considers itself entitled to a greater share in the Government of India.'' And speaking on the Seditious Meetings Bill in 1907 he said ''Far from wishing to check the growth of political thought, I have hoped that with proper guidance, Indian capacity and Indian patriotism might earn for its

* India and the Future—1906.

† Life of Lord Minto by John Buchan.

‡ Life of Lord Minto by John Buchan.

people a greater share in the government of the country. We may repress sedition, we will repress it with a strong hand, but the restlessness of new-born and advancing thought we cannot repress.'' But Lord Minto's political theory was the same as that of his predecessors who had to deal with political reform in India and that was ''to give the people of India wider opportunities of expressing their views on administrative matters.''* And his scheme of Councils must be subject to the essential condition ''that the executive authority of the government is maintained in undiminished strength.'' The note of generous sympathy with the aspirations of the educated classes grows in volume in the utterances of Lord Hardinge. A Quarterly Reviewer writing in 1911 said that the despatch of August 25, 1911, which among other things recommended the repeal of the Partition of Bengal was ''written in a language new for an Indian state-paper.'' ''It is certain'' says Lord Hardinge in that despatch ''that in the course of time the just demands of Indians for a larger share in the government of the country will have to be gratified'' but he also is obsessed with the old fear of the Government of India for he also thinks that the question will be how this devolution of power can be conceded without impairing the supreme authority of the Governor-General in Council. One problem at a time is the theory of Lord Hardinge as of many of his predecessors. The only possible solution of the difficulty,'' he says ''would appear to be gradually to give the provinces a large measure of self-government until at last India would consist of a number of administrations autonomous in all provincial affairs with the Government of India above them all and possessing powers to interfere in cases of misgovernment but ordinarily reserving their functions to matters of imperial concern.'' It would not be an unfair estimate of Lord Hardinge's work if we endorse the view of the Quarterly reviewer ''that political expediency becomes the guiding motive of Indian Government'' and not any new political theory. But still we must not cavil at Lord Hardinge's words or acts for every little counts in the Government of India. His zealous espousal of the cause of Indians in South Africa, his advocacy of the increase of the import duty on cotton without a corresponding increase of the excise duty, the inauguration of an Indian territorial force are all symptoms of a change in the attitude of the rulers of Indian towards political reform. But the radical change in political theory was yet to come. It came with the arrival in 1916 of Lord Chelmsford in India as Viceroy and Governor-General.

When Lord Chelmsford was Governor of New South Wales in 1910 he had come into touch with a school of political students that had just been founded and hearing during his stay in London prior to his assuming the Viceroyalty of India that a branch of this school in London was studying the question of India he ''courteously asked to see the results.'' This school of political thought is now known as the Round Table group. As

* Circular of the Government of India to Local Governments 4th August 1907.

this school of political thought played an important part in forming the new political theory of the Government of India it may not be amiss to trace very briefly the origin of this school for it has contributed one of the most important strands of English political thought in regard to the government of the British empire.* After the conclusion of the South African War, especially in 1906 when responsible government was granted to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony, an Englishman, an official of the Transvaal Civil Service and a few of his friends used to meet and discuss the problem of the future Government of South Africa. This Transvaal official was Mr. Curtis. To these meetings there came also two Indian civilians who had been borrowed from the Indian Civil Service to put the Civil Service of the Transvaal in order. The two Indian Civilians were Sir James Meston and Mr. Marris. These men felt that all the colonies in South Africa should be put under one national government. To work on this problem, Mr. Curtis, who had resigned Government service, collected groups in various parts of the country known as Closer Union societies which included members of both the races British and Boers and all parties and even members of the Government service on the authorization of General Botha. To study especially the question of the attitude of the South African Union in the event of a war between England and Germany, Mr. Curtis together with Mr. Kerr and Mr. Marris went to Canada and it was there in Canada in the year 1910 during a walk in one of the forests of the Pacific slopes that Mr. Marris revealed to Mr. Curtis the view "that self-government however far distant was the only intelligible goal of British policy in India, that it only needed a guiding principle and no other was thinkable."* In 1910 Mr. Curtis proceeded to New Zealand and soon study groups for the impartial study of the problems of government of the British Empire were started. These study groups which came to be established in Canada, England and Australia, especially at University centres, soon came to be known as Round Table groups, and a quarterly journal called the *Round Table* was started which was to contain information on imperial affairs and articles from the various countries included in the British commonwealth. One such Round Table Group was formed at Agra early in the period of the Great war when three members of the Oxford group, an Indian and two English officers of the Indian Territorial force, met, and at the suggestion of the Indian. In the earlier publications of the Round Table group and of Mr. Curtis, India was not discussed but from 1912 onwards Sir James Meston and Mr. William Marris had been urging upon Mr. Curtis the need for the Round Table mind being brought to bear on the Indian problem. Mr. Curtis visited India in 1916 and met a number of men with Round Table leanings and the influence of the Round Table mind on the political theory of the Government of India began. I have

* The account of the origins of the Round Table group is taken from Mr. Curtis' *Letters to the People of India.*

felt it necessary to sketch the history of the rise of this school of thought as it is not only an interesting school in itself, but because it influenced the theory of the Government of India through the minds of Lord Chelmsford, Sir James, afterwards Lord Meston, and Sir William Marris who had so much to do with the framing of the theory upon which the present Government of India is founded. I have done it also to correct an erroneous view which holds the field that the new principle of Government in India was forged in the furnace of the Great War and was more or less a war measure. From the dates it will be seen that the new theory had begun to work in the minds of the rulers of India some time before the war.

It was imbued with the ideas of the Round Table group that Lord Chelmsford came to the business of governing India. Now, what are those ideas? According to Mr. Curtis, one of the founders of this school the British government in India "looks to a time however remote when it will be able to transfer that responsibility to a section of Indians sufficiently large, disinterested and capable of sound political judgment."* Mr. Kerr the editor of the *Round Table* in a letter to Mr. Curtis in 1916 emphasized the imperative necessity that people in Great Britain and the Dominions should realise that "India is going to put forward, and rightly put forward two demands after the war. The first is for a further step towards self-government in India and the second that the interests and views of India should be represented directly when the future of the Empire and its policy is under consideration." "The peoples of India and Egypt no less than those of the British isles and Dominions must be gradually schooled in the management of their national affairs." "The task of preparing for freedom the races which cannot as yet govern themselves is the supreme duty of those who can. It is the *spiritual end* for which the Commonwealth exists, and material order is nothing except as a means to it." We seem to come upon a different world of thought to that with which we were familiar in the 80's and 90's of the last century when we were told that the development of the material resources of the country was the main end of Indian government.

It is not only Mr. Curtis that gave expression to such views which in fact soon became suspect to Indian critics on account of some unfortunate phrases that he used in his early writings on Indian topics. But the writers in the *Round Table* and we have Mr. Curtis' assurance that he rarely wrote in it—gave expression to the faith that was in them. As early as September 1912 we find the following expressions of opinion in the *Round Table*. "On the one side are the interests of the empire (which, in the writer's opinion, can never look upon India as an independent power). On the other side are the interests of India. Nobody doubts that India ought to progress towards self-government.......The ideal goal

* Curtis—Letter to the People of India.

is clear. It is that some day or other India should acquire the status of a self-governing dominion, independent in the control of her own internal affairs, a loyal and willing partner with the other units of the empire in their common concerns. Whether she will ever be able to attain complete self-government will depend entirely on the capacity of her people to progress in knowledge and self-control. Again the writer goes on to say "If in the future India also remains within the empire it will not be because we are strong but because we retain her respect and good will." And so the *Round Table* goes on till 1917 when its ideas were embodied in the famous announcement of August 1917 made in Parliament by Mr. Montagu who really got his inspiration and idea from Lord Chelmsford. In fact a writer in the *Round Table,* December 1917 wishes "that the announcement had been made a year earlier and from the lips of the King Emperor for then it might have greatly eased the situation."

It was with these ideas of the *Round Table* that Lord Chelmsford came to India. In fact Lord Crews told the House of Lords in 1919 that before Lord Chelmsford went out to India in 1916" "he had become clearly convinced in his own mind from conversations he had with those competent to give opinions and from his own reflections on the matter that it would be necessary at once to make an announcement of the character which was made in 1917, namely that the country was looking forward to an advance in India with responsible government as the goal." Lord Chelmsford made known his views to his colleagues in the Government of India, as soon as he reached the country. He himself told the Indian Legislative Council in September 1917, "At the very first Executive Council which I held as Viceroy and Governor-General of India I propounded two questions to my Council.

1. What is the goal of British rule in India ?
2. What are the steps on the road to that goal ?

We came to the conclusion which I hope most Hon'ble members will agree was inevitable that the endowment of British India as an integral part of the British Empire with self-government was the goal of British rule." From these views expressed in India by the Viceroy and the Government of India proceeded the famous declaration in Parliament of August 1917 made by the Secretary of State for India "that the policy of His Majesty's Government with which the Government of India are in complete accord is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible Government in India as an integral part of the British Empire." And of this view the political theory of the *Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms* made by Lord Chelmsford and Mr. Montagu is but the detailed development.

It is not my purpose to submit to you a thorough analysis of this famous document. I am concerned only with its political theory. I am not concerned with the proposals for the reconstitution of the Government of India which are contained in it but with the quantum of political theory which precipitated those proposals. Taking as their text the famous saying of Sir Thomas Munro that "we should look on India not as a temporary possession but as one which is to be maintained permanently until the natives shall in some future time have abandoned most of their superstitution and prejudices and become sufficiently enlightened to frame a regular government for themselves and to conduct and preserve it," the authors of the Report look upon the policy of the British in India "as a persistent endeavour to train the people of India for the task of governing themselves." It comes with some shock of surprise to hear a Secretary of State and a Viceroy of India say that "the inevitable result of education in the history and thought of Europe is the desire for self-determination and the demand that now meets us from the educated classes of India is no more than the right and natural outcome of the work of a hundred years." They make clear their conviction on more than one page "that political capacity can come only through the exercise of political responsibility." The proposals for the devolution of power on the people and their representatives at the different levels of government—local, provincial, imperial—are based on the theory that "the functions of Government can be arranged in an ascending scale of emergency, ranging from those which concern the comfort and well-being of the individual to those which secure the existence of the State." Therefore, they urge that there should be as far as possible complete popular control in local bodies and the largest possible independence for them of outside control. In the provincial area where responsible government must be reached as soon as possible "there must be a period of political education which can only be achieved through gradual but expanding exercise of responsibility." The condition of India, the divisions of Indian society, the political backwardness of the ryots, the slow advance of literacy and education forbid them "immediately to hand over complete responsibility." They would proceed therefore by transferring responsibility for certain functions of government while reserving control over others. But the Government of India they would leave untouched, save for increasing the representative element in the central legislative, as "for such hybrid arrangements precedents are wanting: their working must be experimental and will depend on factors that are yet largely unknown." Although the actual proposals of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford in regard to the reconstitution of the Government of India are open to the criticism of theory and the still more deadly criticism of experience, the fact that has to be remembered to their credit is that they had the root of the matter in them. At last rulers of India have begun to look at the Government from the starting point of the race to freedom. The phrase and with it the purpose of "political educa-

tion'', which suggested itself once to the imaginative genius of a Ripon and was lost sight of and rarely referred to ever afterwards, occurs frequently in the pages of this Report and has become legitimate and been made respectable. The political education of the ryot is placed in the forefront of the programme of government. ''As his political education proceeds'' the authors of the Report say ''he will come to apply the lesson learned in local affairs to the affairs of government also.'' The authors of the Report look not only to candidates but to officials to feel a responsibility for helping him. They realise the close connection between popular education and popular government and urge the governments of the future to speed the pace of literacy so that it may make political progress real and well-founded and beneficial to the masses. That the political theories of the Montagu—Chelmsford Report have become the official opinion of England was proclaimed to the world on Christmas Eve 1920 when a Royal Proclamation was issued the words of which when compared with those of the Proclamation of 1858 measure the distance that the Government of India has travelled since then. ''In truth'' runs King George's proclamation, ''the desire after responsibility has its source at the root of the British connection with India. It has sprung inevitably from the deeper and wider studies of human thought and history which that connection has opened to the Indian people. Without it the work of the British in India would be incomplete.''

To say that the stream of English political thought which has freedom and responsible self-government for its springs has become broad and full is not to say that the other stream of political thought has become dried or is flowing thin and obscure. Although the despotism is gone or is going, the theory of an enlightened State doing things for unenlightened individuals is still there. The Etatism and the State Socialism still reign supreme although the character and constitution of the institutions of the State is becoming modified. The authors of the Report on Indian Constitutional Reform recognise that the ''English theories as to the appropriate limits of State activity are inapplicable in India and that if the resources of the country are to be developed the Government must take action.'' The War especially taught the Government of India the great importance of actively pushing the industrial development of the country if only to make India more dependent on herself for the supply of war material during another great war. ''The Government'' say the authors of the Report ''must admit and shoulder its responsibility for furthering the industrial development of the country.'' The serious difficulties in the way of Indian Industrial development they say ''will be overcome only if the State comes forward boldly as guide and helper.'' They urge the need for the creation of a Technical Service under a separate department of the Government of India. And they are not afraid of a fiscal policy directed in the main by the interests of India. The pre-

sent economic policy of the Government of India foreshadowed by the Montagu-Chelmsford Report illustrates the political truth that theories of state action are quite independent of the constitution of the government. Of the older strand of political theory what has gone is the despotism, But what still remains of the old is the State socialism intensified to a degree not contemplated in the days of British laissez-faire, for State Socialism would seem to be the most popular creed of the chief political parties in India. It is an interesting speculation whether the two strands of political thought will long go together and help each other. For Etatism and State Socialism call for a Bureaucracy. As state action grows in volume, the Bureaucracy will also have to grow in numbers and in power, as the history of modern England has already proved. And a numerous and powerful Bureaucracy (especially when it becomes national) is the greatest enemy of modern Democracy. But the problem of the reconciliation of the two strands of political thought that have so far influenced the Government of India is for the future to determine. I am not concerned with it here but I cannot resist the temptation of stating it as a development of the problem we have been so far considering, and to say that if liberty is to be secure in India, one of the first things that a free and self-governing India will have to do is to give battle to the theory of State action and State interference which however tolerable in a period of foundations and of transition is incompatible with real liberty.

If these lectures were merely historical I should stop here and relieve my audience of the tedium of further listening. But by the terms of the endowment under which these lectures are to be delivered, they are to be an essay in political science. Some attempt at criticism of the political thought that has determined the policy and activity of the Government of India so far is therefore required from me. Lord Acton has taught us to believe that the history of a system or of an idea is often the most powerful criticism to which it may be subjected. An historical explanation of a political idea may be the most powerful solvent of that idea. If we turn to the historical explanation of the earlier political theory of the Government of India we must take note of the date at which it began to be enunciated. The earlier period of British rule under the Crown synchronised with what the late Prof. Dicey in his *Law and Public Opinion in England* has called the period of Benthamism. An essay on Benthamism as a political theory is not necessary for our purpose, but we must remind ourselves of its salient principles for they were the principles that determined the political thought of the governing classes throughout the 19th century, both in England and in India. "Benthamism" says Prof. Dicey "was not in reality the monopoly of the Liberals." The Prelates, the Conservatives, the Whigs, the Liberals, the Radicals of the Manchester school all accepted Benthamite Utilitarianism. It was the dominant creed at the Universities

of Oxford and Cambridge from which the Indian Civil Service was recruited. Austin, one of the greater disciples of Bentham, we know had some influence on Indian administrators like Sir Henry Maine and Sir James Fitzjames Stephen. Sir George Otto Trevelyan speaks in the *Competition-wallah* of the Englishmen in India of his time as a generation that has read Bentham and John Stuart Mill. Benthamism was expressed compendiously in the famous maxim "the greatest happiness of the greatest member." And by happiness was meant not moral contentment but a kind of sufficient material comfort. It connotes mainly material prosperity. The political materialism of the Government of India, its policy in regard to famine, public works, sanitation, irrigation, etc., is therefore to be explained by the influence of Benthamism. Benthamism included freedom no doubt but only in regard to economic life. Free-trade and freedom of contract, and freedom from state interference were the terms in which the school of Bentham spoke of liberty. We have the authority of John Stuart Mill for the view that although James Mill believed in the efficacy of popular institutions and representative government, Austin, was indifferent to representative government and believed more in good government than in self-government. John Stuart Mill has described for us in his *Autobiagraphy*, Austin's political philosophy, He thought, we are told, that there was more practical good government.......under the Prussian monarchy than under the English representative government. In politics Austin acquired an indifference bordering an contempt for the progress of popular institutions. Neither was he fundamentally opposed to Socialism in itself. John Stuart Mill has also told us that early in life, he himself had ceased to consider representative democracy as an absolute principle and regarded it as a question of time and place and circumstances." "There was no necessary connection" says Dicey "between Benthamism and the democratic creed." Political and constitutional reform was not so much the Benthamists' concern as judicial reform and the removal of obstacles to economic and social liberty. It is not to be wondered at therefore that Englishmen coming out to India as Viceroys or Governors or members of the Indian Civil Service imbued with Benthamism concentrated on the promotion of the material prosperity of the people committed to their care and refused to concern themselves with political reform except as far as the exigencies of administration required it. Even, or rather especially, after what Prof. Dicey calls the Era of Collectivism set in England in 1865-1900 there was no change in the objective of Indian policy. The legislation that was passed in Parliament during this later period was mainly economic and social, whichever political party was in power, bearing testimony to the political faith that was in members of parliament and in the public. Factory Acts, Employer's Liability Acts, Workmen's Compensation Acts, Housing Acts, Education Acts, from the staple of legislative production. This collectivist trend in English policy grew strong and formidable in a favourable soil like that

of India and the State action in India in regard to agricultural and industrial development in recent years, although not inaugurated, was encouraged by the influence of Collectivism in England. There was another political teacher who exercised a great influence at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. I cannot help attributing much of the opposition of the earlier political theory to liberty and self-government in India to the influence of the master of those that know in politics, Aristotle, who believed that freedom was not a transferable commodity but was the birthright of born free-men and could not be given to barbarians. On the top of Bentham and Aristotle came the influence of the science and of the popular philosophy of history of the 19th century. It is not fanciful to suggest that Darwin and Galton* and Buckle supplied the biology and history upon which was founded the racial theory of Strachey and Curzon.

It was not merely the preoccupation of Benthamism and Collectivism with economic and social reform and the promotion of material prosperity that accounts for the earlier political theory of the Government of India. There was the historical fact that with the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832 all popular agitation for political reform had come to an end in England. The Chartist agitation had died down before 1858. The Franchise Acts of 1867 and 1885 were rather the result of party tactics than of popular demands. The constitutional battles of Englishmen had been fought and won and were becoming a memory when Englishmen were called upon to assume direct national responsibility for the Government of India. To the Viceroys and Governors and members of the Indian Civil Service who come out to govern India political and constitutional reform simply did not occur at all. Economic amelioration and educational progress were in the line of their thought as they, were in that of Englshmen in England. It is not surprising therefore that, with their minds empty of thoughts of political and constitutional reform but filled with the teaching of Benthamism and of Collectivism, the English rulers of India concentrated on the economic amelioration of the Indian people and on their education. If rulers of India did think here and there of political and constitutional reform, they believed, confronted by the facts and circumstances of Indian life, the size of the country, its population, its religions and social divisions, its social and economic defects, that the foundations of a better and free political life must first be laid. Peace and tranquality must reign supreme, law and order must be maintained secure, literacy and knowledge should spread so as to include within its beneficent influence the masses of India, the Indian peasant must be made more prosperous, Indian industry should be developed, and local self-government become real and efficient before India or its rulers could think of national self-government.

* **Finot—Race Prejudice.**

Just as important as the intellectual influences that I have referred to was the influence of the great event which led to the creation of the Government of India in 1858 in accounting for the opposition of the Government of India to the ideas and institutions of liberty and self-government. The evil trail of the Sepoy Mutiny has much to account for in this respect. We may believe Sir George Otto Trevelyan when he says. "Two months of Nana Sahib brought about an effect on the English character at the recollection of which Englishmen at home have already learnt to blush, but the lamentable consequences of which will be felt in India for generations yet unborn or unthought of." The feeling of caution, hesitancy, fear, distrust in regard to the political and military education of the people ever since then must be laid at the door of the Sepoy Mutiny. The best of Anglo-Indian statesmen confined themselves to spreading the work of foundation for a sound political life over as large a number of years as possible. This argument of "foundations" has led the greatest rulers of India, to take a decisive stand against what one of them called "political concessions." And this argument of foundations leads us to our second line of criticism of the political theory of the Government of India.

That the foundations of a State must be well and securely laid before the superstructure of free self-government can be raised is a truism proved by history to the point of tedious repetition. Free government requires much more than despotic government, an atmosphere of peace and tranquility and a high and wide-spread respect for law. National self-government requires a degree of national unity not needed by absolutism. But analogy is an argument only if it is kept within limits and the analogy with architecture will help us only to a certain extent in political discussion. For, in a State political life cannot stand still while the foundations are being laid. And one way of strengthening the foundations may be to introduce higher forms of political life. If laws are required for strengthening the foundations of the State—an Indian Penal Code, for instance, or an age of Consent Bill, or an Inheritance Bill it may be found necessary as Sir Charles Wood found it necessary to bring representatives of the people into the Legislative Council. If taxes are to be imposed and collected in the measure of the needs of the State it may be necessary to call upon the representatives of the people, as did Edward I in England, to assemble and vote them to Government The grant of self-government is one means of good government, for there is no falser antithesis than that which is popularly placed between good government and self-government. The success of any government depends on the good-will of the governed and even administrative efficiency may gain by making the governed interested participants in the business of government. In the long run and taking a long period value of the results of government it will be found that well-organised self-government

is the surest means of good government. The weakness of the theory of foundations was exposed, before political argument took it up, even by the very facts of political. The very statesmen who were laying the foundations of a modern state in India were forced to create Legislative Councils more or less representative of the people. And history which is fond of such ironic tricks made Lord Curzon who opposed political concessions in India the author of one of them when he piloted Lord Cross' Councils Bill of 1892 in the House Common. And once representative institutions in any form are introduced, they have a habit of demanding powers which depotism from Prussia to China has found it difficult to refuse. If the rulers of India were really opposed to political progress or change, they should not have introduced into India a free press and higher education. But the facts of English and Indian life drove them into the course they had to pursue.

As it was one set of historical facts that accounted for the earlier political theory of the Government of India, it was another set of them that brought the later school of it into vogue. We have seen how it was the South African War and the Great War that set a group of students to think and ponder over the problem of the relations between the various parts of the British Empire and between each of them and England. Although I uttered a caveat against undue importance being given to the War as influencing the change in opinion I cannot on the other hand minimise it. "No one" said Lord Morley in a speech at the National Liberal Club in July 1918 "could suppose for a moment that all the convulsion and passion sweeping over the world was going to pass Indians by. Nothing could be more irrational than to imagine the people of India as saying that they were out of all this and wanted nothing." At a very early stage of the War the Prime Minister warned the British people that "after the splendid demonstration India was already giving of her loyalty to the cause for which the whole Empire was then in arms, our relations with her would have henceforth to be approached from a new angle of vision." As a side issue of the War the publication of the Report of the Mesopotamia Commission also served to contribute to a change of view performing the negative service of exposing the defects of the executive in India. It was a study of these war problems that forced students of Indian affairs to consider the development of the same system of government as obtained in the self-governing Dominions of the British empire as the end of Indian government. It was thanks to the fact that the Viceroy Lord Chelmsford and Indian administrators like Lord Meston and Sir William Marris and makers of English public opinion like Sir Valentine Chirol came under the influence of the school of the Round Table that responsible self-government came to be proclaimed as the official purpose of Indian government. The conversion of Sir Valentine Chirol to the views of the Round Table group is indeed remarkable if we remember that he had said in his first book that Dominion Self-government could be the aspiration only of English com-

munities. We can find the extent of his conversion by comparing the ideas of his later books *India, Old and New* and *India* in the *Modern World* series in which he blesses the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and the Reforms that ensued and wholeheartedly accepts the training of the people of India in self-government as the goal of British policy in India. The *Times* newspaper has also joined the band of converts to the new gospel. Compare what the *Times* said in 1897 with what it says in 1919 and you will have a measure of the distance opinion has travelled in England. On March 14, 1919, the *Times* says "There is no practicable alternative in India to the exercise of the vote at which Mr. Montagu and his colleagues are aiming. In the same way Mr. Montagu is entirely right in boldly insisting that the development of parliamentary and self-governing institutions is an inevitable consequence and result of British rule."

Men of the Round Table group are in positions of power and influence in England and in India and it would seem as if the victory of the school of freedom and responsible government for India was certain. But it is neither complete nor secure. There are still representatives of the old school of Sir John Strachey, Anglo-Indian administrators speaking at English meetings and writing to the English Press with all the influence and prestige that experience gives against the new ideal of freedom. Nor is the victory within the Round Table school itself of the ideas of freedom complete over the old ideas of caution and restraint in regard to political advance. In the writings of the Round Table school as in the speeches of statesmen who are working for the attainment of freedom and self-government for India, there is still a tendency to be obsessed and discouraged by the facts and circumstances of Indian life and to wait upon events, and for things to happen. We still need bolder and more active and more positive acts of progressive statesmenship. The implications of the policy of the political education of India now accepted as the official policy of the Government of India must be developed and worked out in the fullest measure and to the farthest extent. The implications of this policy require that Government shall take measures to promote national unity, social solidarity, the evolution of a common civilisation and culture that are the foundations and supports of national self-government. Government must take the lead in the removal of social obstacles to the political growth of India like rigid caste-marriages, child-marriages and untouchability. It must overhaul the whole system of education—mere extension of literacy among the masses will not do—so as to bring up a race of men that will learn to live the life of freedom and self-government and that will be true leaders of democracy. The relations between Education and Politics pointed out so long ago by Aristotle must be realised by the Government in its educational policy. It must no more be content to play the role of an interested spectator in regard to social reform. The

memory of the Sepoy Mutiny which has now had time to wear itself out must no longer be allowed to cloud its sense of social duty. Nor need the government be afraid of State action in regard to social progress. Indian political opinion has been tolerant of and even prefers state action in the political and economic sphere, and I do not see how it can consistently oppose state action in regard to social reform. Nor can I see how Government can run away from its social obligations. It has placed before itself the attainment of national self-government as its ideal. It finds certain social obstacles that will prevent the attainment of that goal. Of course, a wise government will choose the proper ways and means and will prefer a flank movement to a frontal attack on the citadels of social reaction. But the effort must be made and the thing must be done. The new ideal of political education calls upon Government in India to assume a new and more responsible—and to be frank—a difficult role.

The old ideal of trusteeship no longer completely expresses the whole duty of government in India. The good trustee is concerned with the preservation and development of the property of the persons on whose behalf he holds the trust. I do not know whether the English statesmen who speak of British rule in India as a Trust and of the Trusteeship of England for India use these terms in the legal sense. But the effect is as if they used them thus, for of the nine duties enumerated by Mr. Augustine Birrell in his delightful lectures on the *Duties and Liabilities of Trustees* all have to do with the proper care and development of property for the benefit of the cestui que trust or beneficiary of the trust. The trustee is not called upon to look after the upbringing and education of the beneficiary *qua* beneficiary. Trusteeship as an ideal of Indian government was all very well in the old days when the development of the estate of India was the objective of Viceroys and the Indian Civil Service. It is entirely out of date now when the building of a free state is the goal of Indian policy. Rather, I would use the term guardianship—if one must have a compendious term—which aims at the development of the character of the ward and prepares him for a life of freedom, for it more appropriately expresses the new ideal of Indian government. But whatever term is used, the duty of government according to the new dispensation is clear. He who wills the end, must will the means. And government in the days to come must grasp all the means and use all the means that may be required to further the end. The old role of a judge who decides between conflicting policies or upon the issue of events can no longer be the role of the Government of India. Nor even the role of a mentor who advises from a distance and is indifferent to the course of events running by. Much less can it take up the position of a defender of a citadel of privilege and profit who will yield only to the successful assaults of a besieging army of determined agitators. Sir Henry Maine has told us that "it is practically a principle

of British Government and one, though it occasionally works some injustice, is on the whole justifiable that serious disaster in any department of public affairs should be followed by large legislative or administrative reconstruction.'' But it would seem to be a corrollary of this principle, that not till a disaster occurs should there be reconstruction. That way lies no statesmanship, Far from waiting for and upon popular demand and agitation, Government in India should foresee, anticipate, and inaugurate on its own initiative reforms that are necessary for realising the ends of national self-government in India. That the old policy of granting concessions to agitation, and giving less than what is asked for still persists is proved by the timorous, hesitating policy of the Government in regard to the military and naval education of the people of India. The saying of Benjamin Jowett that ''in India as in England we are apt to do things rather late'' unfortunately still applies. The policy of hesitation and distrust is that of a critic not of a leader. Rather it is the positive and active office of a friend, guide, and leader that the Government of India must assume if it is to realise a policy true to the ideal of political education unto the ends of freedom and self-government that it has proclaimed. It is the political leadership of a people whose feet are set on the road to the promised land of freedom that is the high and difficult office that the Government of India is now called upon to assume.

I cannot conclude these lectures without saying how much I wish they had been more worthy of the University under whose auspices I am delivering them and of the endowment which has made them possible and of the audience that has so courteously listened to them. I know I have done nothing more than gather, and, document and date knowledge that you already possess about the principles on which the Government of India has been conducted. But I thought that even this journeyman's work might serve a good end in this time when the past history of the government of India is being reviewed and the future lines of its development are to be laid down. Anyhow, against the limitations of my achievement I am consoled by the reflection, that in the history of great works of architecture the man who builds the foundation is scarcely remembered and that the artists will soon come who will make the foundation seem necessary but not memorable.